



Amtd 14/B
beaven01.001
J.E. 1030-03
PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
(beaven01.001)

Applicant: Douglas F. Beaven **Paper No.:**
Application No: 09/312,740 **Group Art Unit:** 2986
Filed: 5/14/99 **Examiner:** Heck, Michael

Title: *Processing management information*

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, DC 20231

RECEIVED

OCT 20 2003

GROUP 3600

Response to non-final Office action under 37 C.F.R. 1.111

Summary of the prosecution

On 12/30/02, Examiner mailed a first Office action in the above application in which he required a new Declaration, required correction of the Drawing as specified in the *Notice of Draftperson's patent drawing review*, PTO-948, objected to the Drawing as having two identical figures, and required correction of the drawing; objected to the Specification; and objected to various informalities in claims 11, 12, 13, 14, 26, 27, 28, and 43. Examiner further rejected claims 2-23, 39-62, 64-94, and 96-125 for indefiniteness under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, rejected claims 1, 24, 28, 29, 31, 34, 35-37, 38, 63, and 95 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Lowery, *Managing projects with Microsoft Project 4.0 for Windows and Macintosh*, version 4.0, Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1994 (henceforth "Lowery"), rejected claims 25, 33, and 36 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lowery combined with *ManagePro 2.0 for Windows, version 2.0, Reference Manual*, Avantos Performance Systems, Inc., 1993 (henceforth "Managepro"), and rejected claims 26, 27, 30, and 32 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Lowery in combination with published U.S. patent application 2001/0027455, Abulleil et al., having an effective filing date of 8/21/98 (henceforth "Abulleil"). Applicant amended his Specification, Drawing, and claims to overcome the objections thereto and traversed the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph and 35 U.S.C. 103(a) in a response filed on 4/28/03 with a one-month extension of time.

Applicant received a second non-final Office action in the above application mailed 7/16/03. In the second Office action, Examiner indicated that Applicant's traversal of the rejections had been persuasive. Examiner objected to the Specification and Drawing on the basis of further errors and objected to claims 14, 19, 85, 86, and 122 because of informalities. In his new grounds of rejection, Examiner rejected claims independent claims 1, 38, 63, and 95 as lacking patentable utility and as being addressed to non-patentable subject matter. The dependent claims were rejected as being dependent on claims 1, 38, 63, and 95.

Examiner further rejected claims under 35 U.S.C. 103 as follows:

- Claims 1-26, 28, 29, 31, 34-62, and 95-125 as being unpatentable over Lowery in view of Pearce, et al., *Strategic Management: Formulation, Implementation, and Control*, 4th edition, Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1991, henceforth "Pearce".
- Claim 30 as being unpatentable over Lowery in view of N. Tatum, *Verity and Yahoo! Inc. Sign Distribution Agreement*, Verity, Inc., Sunnyvale, CA, April 12, 1999, henceforth "Tatum".
- Claims 32 and 33 as being unpatentable over Lowery in view of *Managepro 2.0 Reference Manual* (Managepro 2.0 for Windows, version 2.0, Reference Manual, Avantos Performance Systems, Incorporated, 1993), henceforth "Managepro"
- Claims 63-94 are rejected as being unpatentable over Lowery in view of Pearce and Carter, "As program management Function evolves, Benefits Increase", *Water Engineering and Management*, Des Plaines, Vol. 142, issue 3, Mar. 1995.

Applicant has rendered the foregoing rejections moot by replacing the claims presently in the application with a new set of claims 126-186. In replacing the present claims, Applicant is by no means conceding the correctness of Examiner's rejections of the present claims, but rather merely taking advantage of his right to claims which set forth his invention in the most advantageous manner. Applicant will of course demonstrate that the new claims are patentable over the references cited thus far in the application. Applicant is further amending his Specification and Drawing to correct the problems noted therein by Examiner as well as other problems noted by Applicant.